

pear, relating to water fowl or different methods of hunting about the State, some places you can hunt deer with bow and arrows, and some places with rifles. The types of nets for fishing, vary from river to river and county to county. For oysters, of course, the method of licensing, method of taking, and that type of thing would be different. If you recognize that these are areas where the State should have complete control, then I submit that the legislature should have the right to vary the application of the law in any manner that they want.

It is de minimus, because in 1967 there were ten laws relating to local resources passed. This shows on page 41 in the table which is with the Local Government Recommendation, or the Committee Memorandum. In 1966 out of 756 laws there were 11 local laws in the field of natural resources, and I suggest that this is not something that one should get exercised about. It is a particularly de minimus situation when one considers that we have effectively eliminated the truly evil public local legislation relating to local departments and things like that. This is not that type of matter. It is a matter of statewide significance, and I submit that the legislature, which we are trying to strengthen, should have full power over this type of thing.

We are going to have mandatory home rule. We have adopted home powers. We are going to have a unified judiciary. All of this will serve to reduce the work product of the General Assembly, which is local legislation from 52 percent which it was in 1967, to considerably less than 15 percent. I suggest that these provisions, both of them, the exception for natural resources, and the exception for the school system, that both of these should stay in this provision.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Raley.

DELEGATE RALEY: Mr. President and delegates of this Convention, I disagree very strongly with the Chairman of the Local Government Committee. I think that there is nothing more important than the passage of this amendment. It is one of the most important things we can do.

I call to your attention that the preservation of natural resources is one of the most pressing problems facing us. The problem involves whether we are going to have water to drink, whether we are going to have land area to live in, and whether we are going to have food to eat. These things are very pressing problems, and they are

the kind of things that have to be handled on a state-wide comprehensive basis.

Now, what in reality happens is that when you allow these exceptions for local laws, you allow in a subtle way vested interest to put the pressure on those particular delegates or senators to make exceptions in order to protect those interests.

I think this has been a deplorable situation in the past, and if we are going to do anything about it we had better take this provision out.

In reference to Chairman Moser's statement that there were so few local laws passed in regard to natural resources, I would like to read to you a provision in the report by the Wye Institute in regard to oysters. They say: "Depletion and subsidy in the oyster fishery have developed despite biological and marketing advantages possessed by Maryland. The basic cause of these difficulties is Maryland's long-term policy of treating oyster grounds as a shared common resource. The difficulties inherent in this policy have been compounded by the influence of the counties exercised through state laws that are really county laws."

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Raley, will you try another microphone? I am not sure whether the trouble is there or in the amplifier.

DELEGATE RALEY: This is the Wye Institute's report which was a study of the oyster fishery program. It says: "Depletion and subsidy in the oyster fishery have developed despite biological and marketing advantages possessed by Maryland. The basic cause of these difficulties is Maryland's long-term policy of treating oyster grounds as a shared common resource. The difficulties inherent in this policy have been compounded by the influence of the counties exercised through state laws that are really county laws."

And then they give the following alternatives to status quo: "(1) repeal or modification of the county laws; (2) state control of seed-production; (3) easing of gear restriction." I will not go on.

The point they make is that because of this practice of exceptions by counties to state-wide laws, because of the fact that we cannot have overall, administrative orderly procedure in that resource, has cost the economy many thousands of dollars.

But more important than that to you people who live in the City, how in the